

1
2
3
4 JUAN CARLOS ZAMBRANO,
5 Plaintiff,
6 v.
7 ERIC GOLDING, et al.,
8 Defendants.

9 Case No. 19-cv-03332-HSG
10
11

12
13 **ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR**
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

14 Re: Dkt. No. 24
15
16
17

18 Plaintiff, an inmate at Pelican Bay State Prison (“PBSP”), filed this *pro se* civil rights
19 action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that PBSP correctional officials were deliberately
20 indifferent to his serious medical needs, in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Now pending
21 before the Court is plaintiff’s request for appointment of counsel. Dkt. No. 24. For the reasons set
22 forth below, plaintiff’s request is DENIED.

23 There is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case unless an indigent litigant may
24 lose his physical liberty if he loses the litigation. *See Lassiter v. Dep’t of Social Services*, 452 U.S.
25 18, 25 (1981); *Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997) (no constitutional right to
26 counsel in § 1983 action), *withdrawn in part on other grounds on reh’g en banc*, 154 F.3d 952
(9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). The decision to request counsel to represent an indigent litigant under
27 § 1915 is within “the sound discretion of the trial court and is granted only in exceptional
28 circumstances.” *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984). A finding of the
“exceptional circumstances” of the plaintiff seeking assistance requires an evaluation of the
likelihood of the plaintiff’s success on the merits and an evaluation of the plaintiff’s ability to
articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. *See Agyeman v.*
Corrections Corp. of America, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004); *Rand*, 113 F.3d at 1525.

1 Both of these factors must be viewed together before reaching a decision on a request for counsel
2 under § 1915. *See id.* The fact that the *pro se* litigant would be better served with the assistance
3 of counsel does not necessarily qualify the issues involved as complex. *See Rand*, 113 F.3d at
4 1525 (where plaintiff's pursuit of discovery was comprehensive and focused, and his papers were
5 generally articulate and organized, district court did not abuse discretion in denying request for
6 counsel).

7 Plaintiff argues that appointment of counsel is necessary because the case is complex;
8 plaintiff is not competent to litigate the case himself because he lacks education, lacks legal
9 training, has a physical disability arising from the injuries at issue in this action, and suffers from
10 temporomandibular joint syndrome which causes him physical pain, severe headaches, anxiety,
11 high blood pressure, neck pain, jaw pain and depression; the case will require cross-examination
12 of expert witnesses; plaintiff is being denied documentary discovery because he lacks counsel and
13 plaintiff does not know how to obtain the necessary discovery; and plaintiff has been unable to
14 obtain counsel despite making multiple efforts. Plaintiff has not demonstrated the exceptional
15 circumstances required for appointment of counsel at this stage in the action. The case is fairly
16 straightforward, alleging that from mid-2018 to about early 2019, defendants refused to provide
17 plaintiff with appropriate medical treatment for his torn meniscus, in violation of the Eighth
18 Amendment. Plaintiff's letters to the Court demonstrate an understanding of the litigation process.
19 Plaintiff's request for appointment of counsel is therefore DENIED without prejudice to the Court
20 *sua sponte* appointing counsel should the circumstances so require.

21 This order terminates Dkt. No. 24.

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 Dated: 11/24/2019

24 
25 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
26 United States District Judge
27
28